Remarks

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are pending. Claims 1-6 and 8-13 stand finally rejected. The Applicants have cancelled claims 6 and 12, have amended claims 1-4, 8-11, and 13, and have added new claims 15-19 in this Response. As claims 15-19 are computer readable medium claims directed to the method recited in claims 1-5, the Applicants submit that no new matter is being added. The Applicants traverse the rejection set forth by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6 and 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. PG-PUB 2004/0252319 (Gorp) in view of U.S. Patent No.: 6,236,450 (Ogura). The rejection of claims 6 and 12 are moot in view of the claims being cancelled.

Claim 1 as amended recites a method of reprinting a page of a printed document. According to the method, a print job is received by a printer to generate the printed document. A determination is made that a page of the printed document includes an error. The print job is modified to include a new logical page. A user is instructed to load the printed document into an inserter tray on the printer. Each page of the printed document is processed from the inserter tray on the printer to an output tray on the printer by determining if a current page being processed includes the error. If the current page includes the error, the current page is discarded, the new logical page from the modified print file is printed to generate a new page, and the new page is sent to the output tray in place of the current page including the error.

The Applicants submit that neither Gorp nor Ogura teaches or suggests the limitations of "modifying the print job to include a new logical page", "printing the new logical page from the modified print job to generate a new page", and "sending the new page to the output tray in place of the current page including the error" as recited in claim 1. Gorp discloses a print merge device which receives portions of a document from each of a number of printers, and collates the document in accordance with a data file (Paragraph 35). Gorp further discloses that if an error occurs during collation that the affected document portions are reprinted by the processor (Paragraph 36). Nothing in Gorp teaches or suggests that the processor or the print merge device is operable to modify any print jobs to include a new logical page, to print the new logical page to generate a new page, and to send the new page in place of the page including the error. For

example, nothing in Gorp suggests that the processor or the print merge device is operable to modify any print jobs used to generate the document portions affected by collation errors, to print the modified print job to generate new pages, and to send the new pages to the print merge device in place of the document portions affected by the collation errors.

In Ogura, if a document being copied jams in an automatic document feeder mechanism, a user is instructed to re-set the entire document on a document tray. The document pages are then sent from the document tray to a discharge tray without making copies of the document until a counter value is reached. When the counter value is reached, the copier performs a copy process for the remaining pages in the document (Abstract). In Ogura, the copier does not modify any print jobs to generate new logical pages. Ogura also does not print the new logical pages to generate new pages, and to replace any previously copied pages with the new pages. Instead, Ogura operates to recopy some or all of the originally printed document based on where the paper jam occurred.

The Applicants submit that claim 1 recites advantages over the cited art. Using the method of claim 1, for example, a print job is printed to generate a printed document. One or more errors may be included in the printed document. Pages 1, 5, and 10 may include typographical errors. The method recited in claim 1 provides a means for remediating such errors by modifying the print job to include new logical pages (e.g., pages fixing the typographical errors). The original printed document is processed to discard the pages 1, 5, and 10 which include the errors. New pages printed from the modified print job are inserted into the document at the output tray in place of the pages including the errors. After the printed document is processed, the pages marked as including errors are included in the document automatically. Thus, no reprinting of the entire document may be necessary. In addition, manual insertion of pages which include errors may be avoided.

The Applicants therefore submit that claim 1 is non-obvious for at least the reasons provided. Similar arguments apply for independent claims 8 and 15. Dependent claims 2-5, 9-11, 13, and 16-19 are non-obvious for at least depending on base claims 1, 8, and 15.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1-5, 9-11, 13, and 15-19 are non-obvious for at least the reasons provided above, and therefore respectfully ask the Examiner to allow claims 1-5, 9-

11, 13, and 15-19.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **July 22, 2009**   _____/Sean J. Varley/_____
                                                          SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER
                                                          Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397
                                                          Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
                                                          Telephone: (303) 786-7687
                                                          Facsimile: (303) 786-7691
                                                          Customer No.: 50441